UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/580,454	05/30/2000	Nobuhiro Ono	192432USRD	2458

7590 12/13/2004

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, CHAU T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/580,454	ONO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chau Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 October 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/20/2004 has been entered. Claims 1-8 and 10-21 are presented for examination.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 10-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito, U.S. patent No. 5,649,218, Aoyama et al. (Aoyama), U.S. Patent No. 6,526,410, and further in view of Murashita, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,574.

5. As to claims 1 and 10, Saito discloses a document editing system for editing a document in a computer, comprising:

means for discriminating a specified plurality of document areas within an arbitrary area of the document and managing the specified plurality of document areas along with attributes assigned thereto (col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 8, col. 9, lines 36-54 and col. 13, lines 40-56: data in the document is discriminated by tags in order to represent its structure);

means for managing generation and deletion of a tag pair in the document, said tag pair defining a document area including a start tag that identifies a start of the document area and an end tag that identifies an end of the document area (col. 9, lines 36-54 and Fig. 15: structure restoring section 13 restores omitted tags (deleted tags));

However, Saito does not disclose document editing means for editing a character sequence provided in the document while information about the specified document area within the document is retained or updated. In the similar field of endeavor, Aoyama discloses a document editing program 104 for editing document (col. 6, lines 40-57), and the document editing program 104 edits structured documents such as tags or anchors (character sequence) and some parts of the body of the document in Fig. 5A are retained, and other parts are updated in Fig. 5B (Figs. 5A & 5B). Thus, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Saito and Aoyama to include document editing means for editing a character sequence provided in the document while information about the specified document area within the document is retained or updated. Aoyama also provides a method for managing the editing of a structured document for a document processing system capable of managing the editing on the basis of comparison and discrimination of the logical structures of structured documents.

However, Saito and Aoyama do not explicitly disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is uniquely associated only with the document area defined by the tag pair. Murashita discloses a predetermined code (unique identifier) is assigned to a tag in a document such as SGML document which contains document data type (col. 3, lines 25-42 and col. 15, line 17 – col. 16, line 25). Murashita also discloses the predetermined code is inserted before each of the tags <B> (start tag) and </B> (end tag) (col. 22, lines 21-33). Since Murashita discloses tags in markup document which is similar to plurality of tags representing logical structures of Saito and Aoyama, thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murashita with Saito and Aoyama to include disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is uniquely associated only with the document area defined by the tag pair. Murashita suggests that assigning a predetermined code to the tags in the document to compress the

document in consideration of the tag in the document, thereby improving a compression rate of the tag document and decreasing a quantity of data of the same.

6. As to claims 2 and 11, Saito and Aoyama and Murashita (Saito-Aoyama-Murashita) disclose wherein said plurality of document areas comprise a plurality of types of document areas (Saito, col. 6, lines 5-20).

7. As to claims 3 and 12, Saito-Aoyama-Murashita disclose linking at least one linked document to the specified plurality of document areas and passing information about the link to said means for discriminating and managing (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65); and

first means for outputting the at least one linked document linked by said link means for linking at least one linked document, by reference to information about the specified document areas (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65).

8. As to claims 4 and 13, Saito-Aoyama-Murashita disclose wherein said specified plurality of document areas comprise a plurality of document areas specified within the entirety of the document or arbitrary portions thereof (Saito, Fig. 14),and

wherein said document editing system further comprises:

means for managing an arbitrary display format assigned to the specified plurality of document areas (Saito, col. 7, lines 24-34); and

second means for outputting the document managed in the arbitrary expression format provided in said display format (Saito, col. 9, lines 25-65).

9. As to claims 5 and 4, Saito-Aoyama-Murashita disclose means for linking an arbitrary process to the specified plurality of document areas, wherein a trigger to execute the arbitrary process is set for the specified plurality of document areas, and information about the link to the arbitrary process is passed to said means for discriminating and managing (Saito, Fig. 2); and

means for storing the link to the arbitrary process (Saito, col. 7, lines 2-34).

10. As to claims 16 and 20, Saito-Aoyama-Murashita disclose wherein each start and end tag includes an attachment symbol, and said unique identifier id attached to each start tag and each end tag by the attachment symbol (Murashita discloses a predetermined code (unique identifier) is assigned to a tag in a document such as SGML document which contains document data type (col. 3, lines 25-42 and col. 15, line 17 – col. 16, line 25). Murashita also discloses the predetermined code is inserted before each of the tags <B> (start tag) and </B> (end tag) (col. 22, lines 21-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murashita with Takahashi and Ferrel to include disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is uniquely associated only with the document area defined by the tag pair. Murashita suggests that assigning a predetermined code to the tags in the

document to compress the document in consideration of the tag in the document, thereby improving a compression rate of the tag document and decreasing a quantity of data of the same).

11. Claims 6-8, 15, 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (Takahashi), U.S. Patent No. 6,535,875, Ferrel et al. (Ferrel), U.S. Patent No. 6,230,173, and further in view of Murashita, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,574.

12. As to claims 6-8 and 15, Takahashi discloses a method of preparing a tag information management table for editing a document, said method comprising the steps of:

determining whether or not an arbitrary character string within the document is selected (col. 27, lines 9-36);

acquiring tag information pieces, including a kind of tag pair assigned to a document area and a position of a start tag and a position of an end tag, if it is determined in said determining that the arbitrary character string is selected (col. 13, lines 5-25);

However, Takahashi does not disclose assigning a nonoverlapping unique tag ID to the tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step; and storing a link between the nonoverlapping unique tag ID and the tag information pieces in the tag information management table. In the same field of endeavor, Ferrel discloses a tag ID number is

generated and put in a Tag ID Lookup Table when the content is linked to a control by the designer, and each tag is converted to a numerical description during the link, and therefore, the tag ID of the node is a number corresponding to a particular tag (col. 33, line 64 – col. 34, line 15 and Fig. 17). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Takahashi and Ferrel to include assigning nonoverlapping tag Ids to the respective tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step; and storing into a tag information management table for use in editing a document, a link between the tag Ids assigned to the tags in said assigning step and the tag information pieces acquired in said acquiring step. Ferrel suggests that efficiently transmitting tagged content to a computer in an on-line publishing system to provide content providers with increased flexibility for presenting their content to customers.

However, Takahashi and Ferrel do not explicitly disclose each tag ID is unique. Murashita discloses a predetermined code (unique identifier) is assigned to a tag in a document such as SGML document which contains document data type (col. 3, lines 25-42 and col. 15, line 17 – col. 16, line 25). Murashita also discloses the predetermined code is inserted before each of the tags <B> (start tag) and </B> (end tag) (col. 22, lines 21-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murashita with Takahashi and Ferrel to include disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is uniquely associated only with the document area defined by the tag pair. Murashita suggests that assigning a

predetermined code to the tags in the document to compress the document in consideration of the tag in the document, thereby improving a compression rate of the tag document and decreasing a quantity of data of the same.

13. As to claims 17-19 and 21, Takahashi-Ferrel-Murashita disclose wherein each start and end tag includes an attachment symbol, and said unique identifier id attached to each start tag and each end tag by the attachment symbol (Murashita discloses a predetermined code (unique identifier) is assigned to a tag in a document such as SGML document which contains document data type (col. 3, lines 25-42 and col. 15, line 17 – col. 16, line 25). Murashita also discloses the predetermined code is inserted before each of the tags <B> (start tag) and </B> (end tag) (col. 22, lines 21-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murashita with Takahashi and Ferrel to include disclose a unique identifier which is attached to each start and end tag, wherein said unique identifier is uniquely associated only with the document area defined by the tag pair. Murashita suggests that assigning a predetermined code to the tags in the document to compress the document in consideration of the tag in the document, thereby improving a compression rate of the tag document and decreasing a quantity of data of the same).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER